

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 13, 2004. Claims 1-6 are currently pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kawashima* (U.S. 5,201,068) in view of *Son et al.* (U.S. 6,212,408 B1). More specifically, the Examiner has rejected independent Claims 1-4 as being unpatentable over *Kawashima* in view of *Son*. The Examiner asserts that *Kawashima* discloses all the elements of these claims, except for registering the voice command by the user, which the Examiner asserts is taught in *Son* (Col. 10, lines 64-67). It is again respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

As was indicated in the previous response and during a telephone interview between Examiner Tan H. Trinh and Attorney Douglas M. Owens, on May 18, 2004, *Son* is directed to a system and method for enabling a communication device to accept a voice command from a user. However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no section of *Son* that teaches the user registers the voice commands in the communication device as is recited in each of rejected Claims 1-4. In *Son*, voice commands are spoken into the phone and respective operations are carried out according to the voice commands received. However, it is respectfully submitted that in no section of *Son* does the user register what these voice commands will be. Further, it is respectfully submitted that *Kawashima* does not cure this deficiency of *Son*.

In the Examiner's response to our previous arguments, the Examiner again cites Col. 10, lines 64-67 of *Son* as reciting the user registering the voice command mode during a normal call to adjust the hand set volume. This cited section of *Son* reads as follows:

Alternatively, where the user enters the voice command mode during a normal phone call (for example, to adjust the handset volume), it is reasonable for the communication device to anticipate that the user would desire to exit the voice command mode and thus would not reset the timer after acting on the command in step 222.

As can be seen above, this section makes no reference to a user registering a voice command. Rather, this section teaches a user entering a voice command that adjusts the handset volume, while making no reference to how or when the voice command is registered. Claims 1-4 specifically recite that a user registers the voice commands in the communication device. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect in the rejections of Claims 1-4 and it is respectfully request that the rejection of independent Claims 1-4 be withdrawn.

As independent Claims 1-4 are now believed to be in condition for allowance, it is respectfully submitted that dependent Claims 5-6 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent upon independent Claim 1.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-6, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516
PJF/DMO/lah